



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/813,135

03/31/2004

Seiji Okura

826.1942

4913

21171 7590 08/07/2007  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
SUITE 700  
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

JACKSON, JAKIEDA R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2626

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/07/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/813,135	Applicant(s) OKURA ET AL.	
	Examiner Jakieda R. Jackson	Art Unit 2626	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 16, 17, 19, 22, 23, 25 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 16, 17, 19, 22, 23, 25 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                       |                                                                                         |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                           | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. In response to the Office Action mailed November 16, 2006, applicant submitted an amendment filed on March 16, 2007, in which the applicant traversed and requested reconsideration with respect to amended independent claims.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicants argue that Lee describes that the correction of the characters can be done on the screen (column 5, lines 65-66), but fails to disclose or suggest the correction of characters by speech. Although the claim language is not clear, according to the closest interpretation, the claim teaches that a correction unit corrects the translated sentence with the translation outputted from the speech recognition system. This does not mean that the correction is literally done by speech. Therefore, Applicants arguments are not persuasive, however, are moot in view of new grounds of rejections.

Applicants further argue that Lee neither discloses not suggests re-performing speech recognition of input speech, on the basis of the correction contents of the speech recognition result of the speech input. Applicants' arguments are persuasive, but are moot in view of new grounds of rejections.

### ***Specification***

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Art Unit: 2626

***Claim Objections***

4. Claims 1, 16, 19, 22 and 25 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase “selected another translation” and “inputted another translation” is not clear grammatical English.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. **Claims 11-12, 17, 20, 23 and 26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Honda et al. (PGPUB 2005/0259319), hereinafter referenced as Honda..

Regarding **claims 11, 17, 20, 23 and 26**, Honda discloses a system, method, computer-readable storage medium and computer data signal, hereinafter referenced as a system, for translating an original sentence, comprising:

a translation unit translating an inputted original sentence into a translated sentence (translation; column 3, paragraphs 0053-0063);

a translation word input unit inputting another translation word corresponding to one of words composing the original sentence in order to replace a translation word used in the translated sentence (translation; column 3, paragraphs 0053-0063); and

a correction unit re-translating the whole original sentence in order to correct the translated sentence, by using the inputted another translation word that has been inputted into the translation word input unit if a part of speech of the inputted another translation word differs from a part of speech of the translation word to be replaced with the inputted another translation word (columns 3-4, paragraph 0063 with column 10, paragraphs 0173-0176 and column 12, paragraphs 0198-0207).

Regarding **claim 12**, Honda discloses a system wherein

if the part of speech of the translation word inputted to said translation word input unit coincides with the part of speech of another translation word to be replaced with the translation word, said correction unit partially replaces some translation word composing the sentence translated by said translation unit, with the translation word inputted to the translation word input unit (columns 3-4, paragraphs 0053-0063 with column 10, paragraphs 0173-0176 and column 12, paragraphs 0198-0207).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 1-10, 16, 19, 22 and 25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (USPN 6,06,520) in view of Honda.

Regarding **claims 1, 16, 19, 22 and 25**, Lee discloses a system, method and computer-readable storage medium, hereinafter referenced as a system, for translating an original sentence, comprising:

a translation unit translating an inputted original sentence into a translated sentence by selecting each translation word one by one from a plurality of translation words respectively corresponding words composing the original sentence, and by combining the selected translation words (column 5, line 50 – column 6, line 11 with column 12, lines 22-49);

a speech recognition unit (recognition of the input speech) selecting another translation word matching inputted pronunciation from the plurality of translation words except for the translation word selected by the translation unit, and outputting the selected another translation word as a result of the speech recognition (column 5, lines 50-64), but does not specifically teach a correction unit correcting the sentence translated by the translation unit using the translation words outputted from the speech recognition unit.

Honda teaches a correction unit correcting the sentence translated by the translation unit using the translation words outputted from the speech recognition unit (columns 3-4, paragraph 0063 with column 10, paragraphs 0173-0176 and column 12, paragraphs 0198-0207), thereby obtaining an accurate translation result.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lee's system wherein it comprises a correction unit correcting the sentence translated by the translation unit using the translation words outputted from the speech recognition unit, as taught by Honda, to perform adaption of models used for speech recognition with high precision without imposing a burden on the user (column 2, paragraph 0019).

Regarding **claim 2**, Lee discloses a system comprising:

a translation word dictionary file storage unit storing a translation word dictionary file in which both a word used in the original sentence and a translation word for the word are related and registered (column 5, line 65 – column 6, line 11); and

an extraction unit extracting a translation word related to each word composing the original sentence inputted to the translation unit (column 5, line 50 – column 6, line 11), wherein

said translation unit selects a translation word to be used in a translated sentence from a plurality of the translation words selected by the extraction unit (column 5, lines 50-64), and

said speech recognition unit (recognition of speech) selects a translation word matching to inputted pronunciation from a plurality of the translation words extracted by the extraction unit and have not been selected by said translation unit (column 5, lines 50-64).

Regarding **claim 3**, Lee discloses a system comprising

an instruction input unit instructing said system to replace some translation word composing the sentence translated by said translation unit with another translation word or to correct the whole translated sentence (correct; column 5, line 65 – column 6, line 11) wherein

when an instruction to correct the whole sentence translated by said translation unit is inputted to the instruction input unit, said speech recognition unit divides (divided) information indicating the inputted pronunciation and selecting a translation word matching the divided information from the plurality of translation words that correspond to the word but have not been selected by said translation unit (column 8, lines 5-12).

Regarding **claim 4**, Lee discloses a system wherein

when there is a translation word related to the translation word outputted from said speech recognition unit (recognition of input speech) in the translation words that correspond to the word but have not been selected by said translation unit, said correction unit corrects the sentence translated by said translation unit, using both the translation words not selected by said translation unit and the translation words outputted from said speech recognition unit (column 5, line 50 – column 6, line 11).

Regarding **claim 5**, Lee discloses a system wherein

if there is a relationship between translation words registered in said translation word dictionary file, information indicating the fact is further registered (stored in memory; column 19, lines 11-57), and

if information indicating that a translation word that corresponds to the word but has not been selected by said translation unit has a relationship with the translation



Art Unit: 2626

word outputted from said speech recognition unit is registered in said translation word dictionary file (column 5, lines 50-64), said correction unit corrects the sentence translated by said translation unit, using both the translation word not selected by said translation unit and the translation word outputted from said speech recognition unit (column 19, lines 1-10).

Regarding **claim 6**, Lee discloses a system wherein  
when a part of speech of the translation word outputted from said speech recognition unit differs (difference in parts of speech) from a part of speech of a translation word to be replaced before correction, said correction unit re-translates the whole translated sentence inputted to the translation unit, using the translation word inputted to said speech recognition unit (column 14, line 49 – column 15, line 22).

Regarding **claim 7**, Lee discloses a system wherein  
if the part of speech (parts-of-speech) of the translation word outputted from said speech recognition unit coincides (consistent) with the part of speech the translation word to be replaced before correction, said correction unit partially replaces some translation word composing the sentence translated by said translation unit, with the translation word outputted from said speech recognition unit (column 14, line 49 – column 15, line 22).

Regarding **claim 8**, Lee discloses a system further comprising  
a category determination unit (word association) determining a category to which a topic of the original sentence inputted to said translation unit belongs, based on contents corrected by said correction unit (column 13, lines 51-58),

Art Unit: 2626

wherein when translating a newly inputted original sentence, said translation unit uses with priority (priority) a translation word that is frequently used (frequently used) in the category determined by said category determination unit (column 10, lines 57-61 with column 13, lines 33-37).

Regarding **claim 9**, Lee discloses a system further comprising a translation word category information file storage unit storing a translation word category information file in which information indicating a category in which a translation word for a word used in an original sentence is frequently used is registered (frequently used; column 10, lines 54-61 with column 13, lines 33-37), wherein

said category (word class) determination unit determines a category in which a translation word used when said correction unit corrects the translated sentence is frequently used, based on information registered in the translation word category information file (column 13, lines 38-58).

Regarding **claim 10**, Lee discloses a system comprising:  
a category determination unit determining a category to which a topic of an original sentence inputted to said translation unit belongs (column 13, lines 51-58 with column 19, lines 1-57), wherein

information indicating a category in which a translation word registered in the translation word dictionary file is frequently used (frequently used) is further registered in the translation word dictionary file (column 10, lines 57-61 with column 13, lines 33-37 and column 19, lines 1-10),

said category determination unit determines a category in which a translation word used when said correction unit corrects the translated sentence is frequently used, based on information registered in the translation word category information file (column 19, lines 1-10), and

when translating a newly inputted original sentence, said translation unit uses with priority (priority) a translation word that corresponds to a word used in the inputted original sentence, of a plurality of translation words registered in the translation word dictionary file if information indicating that the translation word is frequently used (frequently used) in a category determined by said category determination unit is registered in the translation word dictionary file (column 10, lines 57-61 with column 13, lines 33-37 and column 19, lines 1-10).

### ***Conclusion***


9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jakieda R. Jackson whose telephone number is 571-272-7619. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 5:30am-2:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2626

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JRJ  
August 3, 2007

  
**DAVID HUDSPETH**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**